

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 were pending in the Application and were rejected. By this Response, Claims 1, and 4-5 are canceled, and Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are amended. No new matter is included by the amendments.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6, were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiomi, et al. (US 6,791,615).

The present invention relates to a high resolution camera that can clock out signals relatively faster because of its multiple taps. Image data clocks out serially to the nearest edge. But, as explained in the Specification, there will be subtle differences in the gain and black levels for each group of separately clocked-out pixels. When the image is reconstructed, the eye will easily recognize any differences as shade banding. Small mismatches or incompatibilities in interfacing the imager to the framegrabber can interfere with an accurate restitching of the image frame sections back together. The restitching can have an extra row or column of pixels, or one can be missing.

Anticipation under 35 USC 102(e) requires that each and every limitation in the rejected Claims be shown in a single reference, either expressly or impliedly. The Office has not done that in the case of Claims 2, and 6. The Office Action cites a few passages in the Reference that supposedly teach the alleged point, but really they do not.

Claim 2 recites, "the adjustment is such that said black level is set by temporarily blacking out the imager, and said feedback is used to find a balance of black levels between the channels." But it was rejected as being anticipated in Shiomi at col. 14, lines 13-17 which teaches, "For this reason, in step 158, only the black portion in the image, i.e., the area the luminance value of which is close to zero, is discriminated/determined, and then the offset correction amount is calculated from the determination result in step 160."

Such teaching is not the same. Claim 2 requires the imager be temporarily blacked out. Claim says it another way, "by optically forcing said imager to output its black levels". On page 3 of the Specification, hooding the imager is suggested. Shutting it off from all light is suggested on page 5. The Reference says it uses only the black portion (of normal pictures) in a discrimination to calculate an offset. Optical blacking is not described. A

35 USC 102(e) rejection in this case is inappropriate and misapplied.

Claims 2 and 6 are amended to recite their subject respective matters in independent form since corresponding base Claims 1 and 4 have been canceled herein.

The Chen Reference describes a virtual reality camera for creating and rendering multiple view images, e.g., to mend together individual shots taken by different cameras or at different times into single seamless panoramic images. Title and Abstract.

Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiomi in view of Chen. Claim 3 has been amended to further limit to the inclusion of the framegrabber, e.g., element 222 in Fig. 2 of the Present Application. This then gives the context for operating the pattern generator to do the once-is-permanent calibration that matches the multi-tap camera to its framegrabber. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest framegrabbers, and the pattern matching of Chen is far different in meaning and purpose from the pattern generation and pixel shifting by a framegrabber recited in the pending Claims.

Claim 7 also adds the framegrabber by amendment. The limitation is recited as the need for a permanent calibration done once that is necessitated by matching a multi-tap camera to a new combination with a frame grabber.


Accordingly, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application, with pending Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite matters, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/14/2006

By:


Thomas E. Schatzel
Reg. No. 22,611

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS E. SCHATZEL
A Professional Corporation
16400 Lark Ave., Suite 240
Los Gatos, California 95032
Telephone : (408) 358-7733
Facsimile No.: (408) 358-7720

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1451 on 12/14/2006
(Date of Deposit)

THOMAS E. SCHATZEL

Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Rep.


Signature

12/14/06
Date